

A photograph of a female teacher with short dark hair and glasses, wearing a white t-shirt, sitting on the floor and reading a book to a group of young students. The students are also sitting on the floor, looking at the book. The background shows a classroom setting with bookshelves filled with books and blue storage bins.

# **Title II, Part A— Hot Topics**

**Vivian Smyrl – Federal Program Compliance Division  
August 25, 2021**



Can I do \_\_\_\_\_ with my  
Title II, Part A funds?

# Title II, Part A

## Use of Funds

### 1. Supplement, Not Supplant

### 2. Activities and/or Resources

- a. Comprehensive Needs Assessment (highly recommended!)
- b. District Improvement Plan
  - i. Alignment with challenging State academic standards
  - ii. Meaningful consultation and coordination
- c. Reasonable
- d. Necessary
- e. Allocable
- f. Allowable under Title II, Part A

### 3. EDGAR Requirements

### 4. LEA Policies and Procedures



# Supplement, Not Supplant

**Supplement,  
Not Supplant**

**Title II,  
Part A**

“Funds made available under this title shall be used to supplement, and not supplant, non-Federal funds that would otherwise be used for activities authorized under this title.”

[ESSA Section 2301]

# Supplement, Not Supplant

## Title II, Part A

In order to be supplemental...

Program activities must enhance, expand, or extend required activities.

➤ Resource: [Supplement, Not Supplant Handbook](#) (Pages 4-7)

An auditor will presume that supplanting occurs if the federal funds—

- Provide services required by State or local law;
- Provide same services as those provided in prior school year with State or local funds;
- Provide same services in Federal and non-Federal programs.

➤ Resource: [Supplement, Not Supplant Handbook](#) (Pages 4-7)

# Rebutting the Presumptions of Supplanting

The LEA is responsible for providing documentation to rebut a presumption of supplanting.

- Documentation of rescission of funds or budget reduction.
- Documentation that prior fund source is no longer available.

➤ [Resource: Supplement, Not Supplant Handbook \(Pages 4-7\)](#)



# Traditional SNS Questions to Ask When Planning

- Is the activity/service required by state or local law?
- Did the LEA provide this activity/service in the prior year?
- What funds did the LEA use to provide the activity/service?
- Is the activity/service provided with federal funds to some recipients and with state/local funds to other recipients?

➤ [Resource: Supplement, Not Supplant Handbook](#) (Pages 4-7)



Is it allowable for Title II, Part A funds to be used for the Reading Academies?

Traditional SNS precludes Title II, Part A from being used for the Reading Academies in the instances where the academies are a state requirement. Therefore, the only instance where the academies may be considered allowable under Title II, Part A is if an LEA wants to provide the training to non-K-3 teachers. The HB3 state requirement applies only to Principals and K-3 Teachers.



Can we use Title II to pay for substitutes for our teachers who are attending the Reading Academies?



Because the Reading Academies are a state requirement, Title II, Part A funds cannot be used to pay for substitutes for teachers who attend them to meet the state requirement. In cases where a training is supplemental, however, Title II, Part A funds can be used to pay for substitutes.

## Question 3

Can an LEA use Title II, Part A funds to pay an annual membership to a job application system that allows applicants to submit one common online application to all participating LEAs? This system provides employers with easy access to thousands of applicants seeking employment in the education industry. Members benefit by avoiding the costly advertising expenses for open positions, and they have easy access to web-based modules that facilitate the applicant screening and hiring process.



An employment application system such as the one described is usually for all LEA employees, including employees that may not be considered intended beneficiaries of the Title II, Part A program (i.e. food service, custodial, transportation, etc.). This raises concerns for potential supplanting, as well as not meeting the intent and purpose of the program. Because of this, it is not a use of funds that is recommended.

## Question 4



Would it be an allowable use of funds to have Title II, Part A funds pay the salary of an Assistant Superintendent who supervises principals?





The LEA would have to be very careful to avoid a supplant here. If this is an existing position that has been paid with state/local funds, it would be a supplant to start paying it with Title II, Part A funds. Even if it is a new position, the job duties could also be problematic. Any general administrative duties for the LEA as a whole would likely be outside the intent and purpose of the Title II, Part A program. Coaching teachers and principals could be seen as allowable, but perhaps not normal supervisory duties.

## Question 5

We were granted the Mentor Allotment last year and were able to pay for mentor stipends. This year, we were not granted the allotment, so may we go back to paying the stipends with Title II funds as in previous years?



This would be an example of where the LEA would want to keep documentation showing that the state fund source that had been used is no longer available. (This could be minutes from a board meeting, or from a budget report.) This would be what an auditor would want to see in order for the LEA to successfully rebut the presumption of supplanting.

## Question 6



Can Title II Part A split-fund costs with Title I, Part A since Title I, Part A funds can only cover the cost of Title I, Part A schools? For example, substitutes for training or programs that are evidence based?



It would not be a supplanting issue for Title II, Part A funds to replace Title I, Part A funds (or vice versa) because those statutes only require the federal funds to supplement state and local funds--not other federal funds. However, an LEA would want to ensure that it could document that Title II, Part A funds have been prioritized to meet the needs at campuses that have been identified for school improvement and campuses that have the highest percentage of low-income students. If Title II, Part A funds remain after that, then this could be an allowable activity if it meets with LEA policies and procedures.

## Question 7

An LEA has conducted its needs assessment and has, as part of its plan, set aside a week of training that will begin this year and continue annually. This week will be at the end of July or first of August and it is outside of the teachers' contracted days. This is to be part of the LEA's ongoing PD development for teachers in the classroom. The LEA wants to separate it from all the back-to-school training that occurs during in-service so that teachers will not be so overwhelmed with information. The LEA plans to provide their teachers with stipends to attend that week since it is outside of their contract days and will also have to pay for some of the PD as well. Assuming the PD meets the criteria of T2A, would these be allowable costs for Title 2?



It would be allowable to plan for Title II, Part A to cover some type of PD that the LEA wants to continue on an annual basis. However, they would need to be sure that none of the PD that Title II is paying for is to meet a state requirement. Any PD provided with Title II, Part A funds must be supplemental. It would be permissible to use Title II, Part A funds to be used for stipends to pay teachers for their time to attend supplemental training that is scheduled outside their contracted days.

# Contact Information

Vivian Smyrl

Texas Education Agency

[Vivian.Smyrl@TEA.Texas.gov](mailto:Vivian.Smyrl@TEA.Texas.gov)

Program Support Email Address

[ESSASupport@TEA.Texas.gov](mailto:ESSASupport@TEA.Texas.gov)